1 2	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION		
3))) Criminal Case No.	
5) 2:17-cr-20595-VAR	
6 7	YOUSEF MOHAMMAD RAMADAN, Defendant.)))	
8			
9 10 11	MOTION HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE VICTORIA A. ROBERTS UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Virtual Hearing Via Zoom - Friday, January 15, 2021		
12	APPEARANCES:		
13 14 15 16	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: HANK MOON, ESQ. and DOUGLAS C. SALZENSTEIN, ESQ. United States Attorney's Office 211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2001 Detroit, Michigan 48226 (313) 226-0220		
17 18 19	Fede 613 Detr	EW DENSEMO, ESQ. ral Defender Office Abbott, 5th Floor oit, Michigan 48226) 967-5555	
20	Kody	a Hijazeen, Arabic Interpreter Bellamy, Pretrial Services	
21	Esse	icia Trevino, Pretrial Services nce Patterson, Judicial Law Clerk a Vertriest, Case Manager	
23			
24 25	231 Detr	ene K. May, CSR, RPR, CRR, RMR W. Lafayette Boulevard oit, Michigan 48226) 234-2605	

1	TABLE OF CONTENTS	
2	PROCEEDINGS:	PAGE:
3	Appearances	3
4	Preliminary Matters	4
5	Arabic Intepreter Sworn	4
6	Court Addresses Plea and Discovery Issues	4
7 8 9	Remarks by Mr. Densemo Remarks by Mr. Moon Response by Mr. Densemo Requests by the Court Court's Ruling	4 6 10 15 41
10	Court Addresses Motion for Bond	
11 12 13	Argument by Mr. Densemo Reply by Mr. Moon Response by Mr. Densemo Court's Ruling Remarks by Ms. Trevino	24 33 37 41 50
14	Court Reporter's Certificate	62
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
Friday, January 15, 2021
 1
              10:34 a.m.
 2
 3
              THE CLERK OF THE COURT: The United States District
 4
    Court for the Eastern District of Michigan is now in session.
 5
    The Honorable Victoria A. Roberts presiding. Calling the case
 6
 7
    United States of America versus Yousef Ramadan, case number
    17 - 20595.
 8
              MR. MOON: Good morning, Your Honor. Hank Moon on
 9
10
    behalf of the United States.
              THE COURT: Good morning.
11
              MR. SALZENSTEIN: And Doug Salzenstein on behalf of
12
    the United States, Your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: Good morning.
14
              MR. DENSEMO: Good morning, Your Honor. Andrew
15
    Densemo on behalf of Yousef Ramadan.
16
              THE COURT: Good morning.
17
              MR. DENSEMO: Good morning.
18
              THE COURT: And Mr. Ramadan, we have an interpreter,
19
20
    Ms. -- I'm sorry. How do you say your name?
21
              THE INTERPRETER: Your Honor, Rania Hijazeen.
              THE COURT: Hijazeen, thank you very much. And we'll
22
    swear you in.
23
              THE CLERK OF THE COURT: Ms. Hijazeen, can you raise
2.4
25
    your right hand?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will translate the questions and the answers put to this defendant to the best of your ability? THE INTERPRETER: Yes, I do. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. And we also have present our court reporter, Darlene May. Thank you. Kody Bellamy and Patty Trevino and one of my law clerks, Essence Patterson. All right. There are a few things on this agenda this morning for this hearing that we are going to talk about. Whether Mr. Ramadan is going to plea and, if so, what would be the terms of that. There's issues concerning access at Milan by counsel and Milan's response to that that I would like to get on the record, and there's a motion for bond that Mr. Densemo has made for his client. For starters, Mr. Salzenstein, you in one of your E-mails said that we were doing a lot of E-mail communications and everything needed to be on the record. I don't know that I agree with that, but everything has been -- there haven't been any ex-parte communications. But I invite you to put on the record and to file anything and everything that you think need to be filed formally as part of the record. All right? MR. SALZENSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor. I agree. Ιt was just a precaution, I think, for the future to schedule a hearing. And I appreciate that, Your Honor, scheduling this

hearing today. 1 THE COURT: All right. Can someone update me first on 2 the likelihood of a plea here? 3 MR. DENSEMO: Your Honor, I don't think that we can 4 give the Court an update on that. Two days ago I received an 5 E-mail from Mr. Moon and Mr. Salzenstein that there was a 6 7 possibility of a conditional plea. I then sent an E-mail to 8 Mr. Ramadan advising him that there had been an opening in terms of the possibility of a conditional plea and I have not 9 10 had any conversations with Mr. Moon or Ms. Salzenstein about 11 what that conditional plea would look like. 12 Mr. Ramadan said that he is interested in seeing what a conditional plea might look like. So we are open to those 13 kinds of discussions, but we haven't had any formal discussions 14 regarding what the parameters of that plea agreement would be. 15 So at this point in time, Your Honor, we can say that we intend 16 to pursue that option or look into it, but that's about all 17 that I can say about that at this point. 18 Okay. All right. Thank you. 19 THE COURT: And Mr. Moon, Mr. Salzenstein, do you have anything 20 21 more on that? You did indicate, yes, you're open to a 22 conditional plea. Do you have anything more on that right now? MR. MOON: Nothing further at this point, Your Honor. 23 From talking with Your Honor -- and the Court, we've offered 2.4

the conditional plea to appeal the suppression issue and are

```
1
    waiting for Mr. Densemo to let us know what --
              THE INTERPRETER:
                                Your Honor?
 2
              THE COURT: Wait. Wait, Mr. Moon.
 3
              THE INTERPRETER:
                                The interpreter apologizes and asks
 4
    the Court to go a little bit slower, if you please. Mr. Moon
 5
    spoke a little bit too fast and there was sound issues for the
 6
 7
    interpreter.
 8
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
 9
              So, Mr. Moon, can you start over and slow down.
              MR. MOON:
                        My apologies. As Your Honor indicated, the
10
11
    government received permission for a conditional plea to allow
12
    Mr. Ramadan to appeal the suppression issues, which is our
    understanding of what he would like to appeal. And we, as
13
    Mr. Densemo said, have heard nothing back on that and are happy
14
    to engage in those conversations.
15
              THE COURT: Are you waiting to hear from Mr. Densemo
16
    or are you waiting to hear from someone else with the
17
    government?
18
              MR. MOON: From Mr. Densemo, Your Honor.
19
              THE COURT: And he sounds like he's waiting to hear
20
21
    from you. So where's the breakdown here?
                         In our E-mail, we indicated that we would
22
              MR. MOON:
    offer Mr. Ramadan a conditional plea to appeal the suppression
23
2.4
    issue if he's interested, to let us know if he's interested and
25
    we will work out all the terms, and we never heard back.
```

2.4

MR. DENSEMO: Your Honor, obviously, I've been -- I've had some communications with Mr. Ramadan over the phone, but those have been of a limited nature. And they are unmonitored, which is one of the things that we'll get into in the detention hearing.

THE COURT: You said and they have been monitored?

MR. DENSEMO: There was one unmonitored phone call and that was initiated with the assistance of the U.S. Attorney's office and that is the phone call wherein I indicated to Mr. Ramadan that the government indicated that there was a conditional plea. That they were willing to a conditional plea.

But, obviously, we did not have the time or the facilities to go into — to have a lengthy, meaningful conversation about that. The government assumes that the only issue that Mr. Ramadan is interested in appealing is the suppression issue. That is an incorrect assumption, I believe. I believe that there are other issues that were raised during the course of these proceedings that Mr. Ramadan would probably be interested in appealing as well. So I would have to talk to Mr. Ramadan and find out exactly what other issues he'd be interested in appealing and then get back with the government to see if they had any objections to an appeal on those issues. So there's still more work to be done.

THE COURT: All right. So I just want to make sure on

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
who is waiting on who. It sounds like the ball is in your
court, Mr. Densemo, to have a discussion with your client and
then to get back with Mr. Moon.
         MR. DENSEMO: That's correct, Your Honor. I agree
with that.
         THE COURT: All right. And you want to have an
unmonitored call or a visit?
         MR. DENSEMO: I would like my client released and that
would obviate any need for a monitored call or for a visit at
the detention center.
         THE COURT: Okay.
         MR. DENSEMO: We could have unfettered access to one
another and have a real meeting between attorney and client.
         THE COURT: All right. Can we spend a little bit of
time talking about these phone calls? Because it's a broader
issue than this case that I would like to follow up on after we
have done -- are done with this.
         Mr. Moon, your information from the warden is that
unmonitored phone calls are scheduled whenever attorneys
request them; is that true?
         MR. MOON: Yes, Your Honor. And in a follow-up, I got
some numbers from the court. In -- as the court indicated, in
December there were 32 legal or unmonitored calls and 15 legal
or unmonitored visits. And that was, obviously, during the
COVID outbreak, for 47 in December.
```

2.4

Thus far in January, there have been nine legal visits and 47 legal calls. With an additional 17 legal calls scheduled between now and January 22nd. In total, Your Honor, that's 120 legal calls or visits in the last six to seven weeks.

I know Mr. Ramadan (sic) has had both a legal call and a legal visit, that I'm aware of, with his client. We've provided the discovery log as well as Mr. Ramadan's request in 2020 for legal calls. There were, I believe, five in March. All were granted. According to Milan, the only instance where Mr. Densemo requested a call or visit and was denied was on December 8th, 2020 when Mr. Ramadan was in isolation for testing positive.

You know, finally, I would say there seems to be some confusion over what is a recorded call and what isn't. Inmates are only allowed to place two types of calls. Regular calls that they generally make to their families. Of course, they can also call their attorney this way. But any of those calls starts with a very clear disclaimer that the call is monitored. And, in fact, the other end or recipient of that call has to hit a button to accept those terms before starting the call.

The only other option are legal calls, which are always unmonitored. So the only way that Mr. Densemo could have been on an unmonitored call is if he or someone in his office that answered the call acknowledged that it was

monitored and proceeded anyway.

2.4

issues or call logs. Again, I've provided those. Mr. Ramadan has reviewed his discovery 80 times since he's been incarcerated totaling hundreds of hours. He was offered a chance to review his discovery on December 29th and declined.

I'm happy to go into further details on the discovery

He reviewed it for three hours and 45 minutes on November 24th and the logs indicated that there are no requests of Mr. Ramadan to make a call or view his discovery that was denied.

THE COURT: All right. Any response to that, Mr. Densemo?

MR. DENSEMO: Yes, Your Honor. I just began using monitored phone calls. And this was at the insistence of Mr. Ramadan who advised me that our calls were being monitored. Now, Mr. Moon is correct that there is a recorded voice that tells you at the beginning of the call that the calls may be monitored. And I typically in the past have indicated that this is an attorney/client phone call and the call should not be monitored to advise the official that what they are listening to is a privileged communication.

THE COURT: May I just interrupt for a moment? So are there magic words that have to be said? You said it's a recording, Mr. Moon. What has to be said in order to make sure that the call does not get monitored?

```
Well, again, I think there's some confusion
 1
              MR. MOON:
 2
    over monitoring. The call is recorded automatically by a
    computer system. In terms of monitoring, we have never
 3
    requested, at least to my knowledge, Mr. Ramadan's recorded
 4
    phone calls. Certainly since I have been on the case in the
 5
    last year and, to my knowledge, nobody has listened to them.
 6
 7
              So by monitored I mean they are recorded by a computer
    system.
 8
             That is different from listened to or reviewed -- and,
 9
    again, I can't speak for Milan. I don't represent them.
10
    certainly for Mr. Salzenstein, myself, the agents investigating
    this case, we have not obtained Mr. Ramadan's phone calls.
11
12
    least in the last year since I have been active on the case.
              THE COURT: So, Mr. Moon, for me to be clear, is
13
    everything, then, recorded, even monitored and unmonitored?
14
    What gets recorded?
15
16
              MR. MOON: The nonlegal calls get recorded.
              THE COURT:
17
                         Okay.
                         So when an inmate wants to call out from
              MR. MOON:
18
    the facility -- I believe during COVID they have 500 minutes in
19
20
              They go to the kind of open phone banks and they make
21
    a monitored calls. Whenever an attorney or the inmate requests
22
    a call with his attorney, they go to a separate room to an
23
    unrecorded, unmonitored line. And, of course, the government
2.4
    never has access to those nor are they recorded.
25
              You know, Mr. Densemo can state what he would like at
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
the beginning of a computer recorded phone call, but the
computer is going to record that phone call regardless of what
he says.
         THE COURT:
                    Okay. All right.
         Just to be clear, Mr. Densemo, I'm sure you know there
is a separate bank of phones that are to be used by your
client?
         MR. DENSEMO: I know that now, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: You didn't know it before. All right.
         So, Mr. Moon, when a lawyer -- okay. A separate bank
of phones for an inmate to go to to make a legal call. When a
lawyer wants to call in on a legal call, how does that happen?
         MR. MOON: The attorney can contact the facility. And
there's a legal guide that was just updated in January of this
year. He can call the case managers for Mr. Ramadan and they
will facilitate and set up that call. So it goes either way.
Either Mr. Ramadan can request of his case handlers or
Mr. Densemo can call or E-mail and request a call or visit that
way.
         MR. DENSEMO: Your Honor, that sounds good in theory,
but that's not what happens in practice. Mr. Ramadan has
requested monitored phone calls. They have gone -- they have
been ignored. I have sent E-mails to counsel -- to the
counselor at the facility and there are sometimes I haven't
even gotten a response from these counselors. I've had to ask
```

2.4

my legal assistants if they will contact the counselors because the counselors seem hesitant or unwilling to return my E-mails.

And this has been done for both visits -- for visits for days other than Mr. Ramadan's visits on Fridays and Sundays and for unmonitored phone calls. So in theory all of this sounds very good, but it doesn't work that way in practice. And not only for me, but there are other attorneys in my office who are having the same experience and attorneys in private practice are having the same experience.

These counselors are inundated with work. And getting to -- responding to requests for an unmonitored phone call sometimes goes unanswered, oftentimes goes unanswered. I've gotten very frustrated with counselors not returning an E-mail. Not responding to my requests to see and meet with my clients. Not only Mr. Ramadan, but there are other clients at Milan as well.

So what the facility is telling the U.S. Attorney's Office and the Court, it is the same thing. I had no problem getting an unmonitored phone call with Mr. Ramadan when the U.S. Attorney's Office was involved or when the probation department and pretrial services is involved. Once these individuals at the facility see that there is someone looking at how they are conducting their business, then all of a sudden they're sufficient. But if there are no eyes on them, then they don't operate in the same way.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
Now, as to the representations about my contact with
Mr. Ramadan in December, I attempted to see Mr. Ramadan at the
beginning of December and was turned away because there was a
hundred -- the west unit had been shut down because a hundred
inmates had tested positive.
         Then, a week later, we received two E-mails.
visits. No contact. Nothing. No phone calls. So these
representations about access are false. There was no contact
in December with inmates at Milan. And I can send the U.S.
Attorney's Office and the Court the E-mails saying you cannot
call your client, you cannot see your client and they can't
call or see you or anyone else for that matter. We have an
outbreak here. There's no one in. No one out.
         So these representations that the BOP is giving the
government, that sounds good. I didn't see that in operation.
         MR. MOON: Your Honor, may I respond just very
briefly?
         THE COURT: Just give me one moment, Mr. Moon.
our E-mail communications, Mr. Densemo, I did ask that you go
back to your office. I think you had already told the Court
about a contact that Mr. Minock had tried to make --
         MR. DENSEMO: That's right.
         THE COURT: -- that was not successful. And I've
asked that in order to follow up on this, because it's not
going to be resolved in this hearing. I think that there is an
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
important issue of access being raised that should be examined.
But I think that the attempts that you're talking about that
people have made where they have been denied, they need to be
documented. And so, what about that?
         MR. DENSEMO: I've asked -- I've talked to Mr. Leon
Parker who expressed similar concerns or similar situations
that he's had. Rafael Villaruel has indicated that he was
going to contact the Court as well. I believe there may have
been one or two other attorneys in my office who indicated that
they were going to contact the Court. If they haven't, I will
urge them to immediately contact the Court with their
experiences regarding access at Milan. But I did have
conversations with Mr. Villaruel and Mr. Parker regarding this
issue.
         THE COURT: Okay. So Mr. Densemo, can I ask that this
be a little more formal and rather than I get an E-mail or call
from someone --
         MR. DENSEMO: Absolutely.
         THE COURT: -- could your office capture everything
and send it out together?
         MR. DENSEMO: I will talk to Mr. Carter, the head of
our office, Your Honor, and ask him to formalize a letter to
the Court with instances where we have had difficulty obtaining
access with our client.
         THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
```

1 Mr. Moon, yes? MR. MOON: Two points, Your Honor. First, in regards 2 to global access at Milan, you know, that is clearly beyond 3 this case. Not that it's not an important issue. 4 THE COURT: Right. 5 I don't represent Milan and I certainly MR. MOON: 6 7 don't speak for our office. I've tried to provide the 8 information that I can, you know, about the 120 calls and 9 visits. But beyond that, I don't have much authority there and 10 I would somehow request that that -- if it's a larger issue, be 11 raised as a larger issue. 12 THE COURT: Yes. What's your second point? MR. MOON: To Mr. Ramadan in particular, Your Honor, I 13 provided the discovery logs and his requests. The court -- or 14 the facility writes down every time he's requested a legal 15 The Court monitors his discovery on an individual basis. 16 And it isn't the first time that Mr. Ramadan has made these 17 claims. 18 In August of 2019 in front of Judge Battani, 19 20 Mr. Ramadan claimed that he was denied access to his discovery 21 for two or three months. But if you look at the discovery log, 22 he had access to his discovery 14 times in that three-month 23 period, totaling 75 hours worth of access. So Mr. Ramadan 2.4 keeps making these claims that are provably false, that are 25 demonstratively false.

2.4

You know, you have seen them yourself with his health issues. And every time he makes these claims, the government spends hours running them down. It's not just those issues. He's claimed that he was beaten before. He's claimed that he's had money and gold jewelry stolen from him. He lied about his escape paraphernalia. In every one of these issues, the government is left to prove a negative and we do so and we present that evidence with nothing that we can argue about.

Again, we haven't seen a single E-mail or phone call that went unanswered or a single incident of Mr. Ramadan being denied access to anything.

MR. DENSEMO: Well, I'm telling you he's been denied access and I'm not lying to you. I'm telling you there have been instances where I haven't had access to him and I couldn't see him and weeks have gone by that we haven't talked and I haven't gotten a phone call or an E-mail from him. So I'm telling that you that there have been access issues and that he has constantly complained to me about being unable to review his discovery or being moved out of the discovery room because he had to go to the bathroom and being told, well, since you left the discovery room, you are no longer able to review your discovery. Simply because he had to go and use the bathroom or because he was hungry or some other excuse that the BOP made to get him out of the discovery room and move another inmate in.

There are 300 inmates at that facility all wanting to

```
1
    use two or three computers. And so there is this rush for all
 2
    of these inmates to try and get in and help themselves on their
    cases as much as they can. There have been times when
 3
    Mr. Ramadan asked for access to the discovery and was told it
 4
    was unavailable or he couldn't get in because other people were
 5
    there.
 6
 7
              This whole issue of Mr. Ramadan is lying and you can't
 8
    trust him, well, I'm telling that you I have had problems with
 9
    access to my client on several occasions and I'm not lying to
10
    you.
11
              THE COURT: Okay. I agree with you, Mr. Moon, that
12
    these access issues are broader than Mr. Ramadan and that's why
    I've asked Mr. Densemo to go back to his office and have
13
    Mr. Carter document the complaints that Mr. Densemo has in the
14
    Ramadan case as well as the complaints that other officers of
15
    the court say that they have had with access. So I think we
16
    can move on.
17
              But once I get that and deal with it within our court,
18
    whom from the U.S. Attorney's Office or Bureau of Prisons,
19
20
    Milan, should we be in touch with?
21
              MR. DENSEMO: Well, apparently, it appears to be
22
    Mr. -- I'm sorry.
23
              THE COURT: No. No. I'm talking to Mr. Moon or
    Mr. Salzenstein.
2.4
25
              MR. DENSEMO: All right.
```

```
THE COURT: Mr. Moon, are you frozen? Are you there?
 1
 2
              MR. MOON: I'm sorry. I was frozen there for a
             I heard once I get that whom. I'm assuming you're
 3
    asking whom in my office would you contact?
 4
              THE COURT: Yes, exactly. Yes.
 5
              MR. MOON:
                         I would recommend contacting the criminal
 6
 7
    chief, Mark Chutkow.
 8
              THE COURT: Okav.
              MR. MOON: He's aware of these issues through this
 9
10
    case and I think he or the deputy, Ben Coats, would be in the
11
    best position to address those.
12
              THE COURT: Okay. All right, then. Thank you.
             Maybe, Mr. Moon, if I could just ask you, if
13
    Mr. Chutkow is already aware, then, perhaps he's already aware
14
    of the information you have provided to me through the E-mails
15
    and so can you make sure that he has all of that to bring him
16
    current and then we will move outside of the realm of this case
17
    and try to address the access issues.
18
              MR. MOON: Yes, Your Honor.
19
20
              THE COURT:
                         All right. Thank you.
21
              All right. So we've talked about the plea. We know
    the plan there. We've talked about Milan.
22
23
              I did ask -- there wasn't ...
              Mr. Densemo, your client has his hand up.
2.4
25
              MR. DENSEMO: Yes. I saw that, Your Honor. I think
```

```
he wants to address the Court.
 1
              THE COURT: Do you want him to address the Court?
 2
              MR. DENSEMO: I think he wants to talk about the
 3
    conditions at Milan, Your Honor.
 4
              THE COURT: All right. I don't know that I want to do
 5
    that, generally.
 6
 7
              Mr. Ramadan, I'm not prepared to do that right now.
 8
    So let me move on with what we have here to address as part of
 9
    this hearing.
              When we were on the telephone conference last time
10
11
    there was a -- we did talk about quideline calculations.
12
    ask Kody Bellamy to take a look at those calculations in
    addition to what had been done by Mr. Moon and done by
13
    Mr. Densemo. I know this agreement between Mr. Moon and
14
    Mr. Densemo on what those calculations should be, but the
15
    preliminary calculations that I got back from Mr. Bellamy were
16
    an offense level of 24, criminal history category of one and
17
    guideline range of 51 to 63 months.
18
              Is that correct, Mr. Bellamy? Thumbs up?
19
              PRETRIAL SERVICES REPRESENTATIVE: Yes, Your Honor.
20
21
    That's correct.
22
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I just wanted to
    share that with you, counsel.
23
              All right. Is there anything more before we talk
2.4
25
    about the motion for bond?
```

No, Your Honor. 1 MR. DENSEMO: THE COURT: Mr. Moon, do you have anything else? 2 MR. MOON: Your Honor, before I close that last issue, 3 I just wanted to let Your Honor know that Milan did indicate 4 that they would provide the Court twice weekly updates on the 5 conditions at Milan. Again, those won't go through me. 6 7 should go directly from Milan to the Court. 8 THE COURT: Yeah. MR. MOON: But I'm happy to provide contact 9 10 information there. I was also told to share that there are 11 currently zero COVID cases among inmates at the detention center and that's all the knowledge I have on that issue. 12 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. We were getting 13 weekly reports from Milan. They were going to David Weaver. 14 He was sharing them with all the judges and then they just 15 16 stopped. But that information was very helpful as we were handling these COVID cases coming out of Milan And I'm glad 17 that it's going to resume. I know that our new court 18 administrator Ms. Essix has been in touch with someone at Milan 19 20 and I'm glad they're going to resume. 21 MR. DENSEMO: Your Honor, if I may, I know the Court wants to move on, but I'd like Mr. Ramadan to respond to that 22 23 very last statement made by Mr. Moon in that there are zero 2.4 cases at the detention center. I would like to find out if

25

that's his understanding.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

I mean, he's -- Mr. Ramadan is in the unit with these individuals. He can see who is being isolated and who is testing positive. So I would just like to get -- have him respond to that because I don't know. THE COURT: I'll give your client a few moments, but I don't want to spend a lot of time on that. MR. DENSEMO: I understand, Judge. THE DEFENDANT: I will thank everybody to schedule this hearing first and to give me the time. And, actually, you know, we still have COVID cases here and there's still isolation. I think at least in the west unit here, you know, they have -- they move the individual to a different area. And if you want, I can call the health service right now. She's in front of the door. I can call her to the door about this. MR. DENSEMO: You just tell the judge what you know about COVID cases in your unit? THE DEFENDANT: Okay. So currently we just finished the lockdown for the COVID. And we have, I believe, zero cases in that unit. But I would like to address that phone call -- I mean, the phone calls and about the attorney phone calls. All the numbers that Mr. Moon he was talking about in December, this only has been in the east side and not the west side. Because the west was locked down. No phone calls coming out. come here.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Ramadan, I don't want to be
rude, but I don't want to go back to the phone call issue, I
think Mr. Densemo has sufficiently addressed it. I don't have
all the information that is necessary to go back to the other
judges and see if there is anything that we want to do at the
bench, but that's how I'm leaving it right now.
         I have enough information on your case and I would now
like to move to the motion for bond. And I would like to hear
from Mr. Densemo.
                   Thank you.
         MR. DENSEMO:
                       Thank you.
         THE DEFENDANT:
                        Okay.
         MR. DENSEMO: Your Honor, before I do that, what
Mr. Ramadan said was pretty interesting. If, in fact, the data
that Mr. Moon quoted was data from one unit, the east unit and
not the west unit, then the BOP is deliberately providing the
U.S. attorney and the courts false information. So that should
be looked into. I think that is pretty serious.
         Because the government has relied and indicated to the
Court that there is access and here are the numbers.
the numbers are coming from the east unit which was open and
not the west unit, that's deceptive and deliberately
misleading.
         Now, as to the bond, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Mr. Ramadan, can you put your mute on?
         THE DEFENDANT: (Complies.)
```

```
THE COURT:
                         Thank you.
 1
              MR. DENSEMO: Shall I proceed, Your Honor?
 2
              THE COURT: Yes, please.
 3
                            By our calculations Mr. Ramadan has
              MR. DENSEMO:
 4
    probably served the time he would have been required to serve
 5
    if he had been sentenced to around five years.
 6
 7
              With the addition of sentencing credits and halfway
 8
    house or home confinement, Mr. Ramadan has served more than the
    time he would have been required to serve given the additional
 9
10
    sentencing credits built into the First Step Act. Eighty-five
11
    percent of a 57-month sentence, which in this case would be a
    midpoint of the quidelines, is 48 months. Six months halfway
12
    house or home confinement placement would mean that Mr. Ramadan
13
    would be released from custody next month or possibly this
14
    month.
15
              Each additional month Mr. Ramadan spends in custody
16
    means that he may be serving a longer prison sentence under the
17
    most dire circumstances than the law requires.
18
              THE COURT: Mr. Densemo, may I just interrupt you one
19
20
    moment?
             I just want to make sure.
21
              Mr. Moon, you continue to oppose this motion for bond?
              MR. MOON: Yes, Your Honor. That's correct.
22
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. Go ahead,
23
2.4
    Mr. Densemo.
25
              MR. DENSEMO: And what if Mr. Ramadan's acquitted at
```

2.4

trial? All the time he's spent in custody can't be returned to him. All the special events in our lives that we often take for granted will continue to pass him by as he languishes in custody waiting for the court's reopening and wondering where in the long line of individuals waiting for trial will he be placed. Some may adopt a position that he's guilty anyway. So let him sit there until next year if need be. I know that is not the view of this Honorable Court.

Punishment has already been meted out. Our message to the community has already been sent. If spending nearly four years in prison and contracting a deadly virus doesn't deter criminal conduct, little else will. Not being with your family and being deprived of a normal life for nearly four years truly insensitives law abiding conduct. If Mr. Ramadan were released today and never served another day in prison, it would be hard to argue that he had not already received a great deal of punishment for any unlawful conduct. The question becomes how much more punishment does he deserve.

In United States versus Spano at 476 F.3d 476, a Seventh Circuit case, the court held that conditions of confinement is a valid 3553(a) consideration. Recognizing that sentencing judges can take into account the harshness of prison conditions when assessing the severity of the sentence.

In the *United States versus Indarte*, 17-5554, Westlaw 6060299 from the Western District of Washington. It's a 2020

2.4

case. The court held that: "The factors relating to the need for just punishment has dramatically shifted and that lockdown measures have made confinement much more punitive than was contemplated."

In *United States versus Noriega*, the court stated that: "Segregated confinement is a more difficult type of confinement than in general populations. For some, the consequences of such depravation can be serious."

Consider also that the government has for the past 41 months consistently advised Mr. Ramadan that he will also face prosecution in the state of California for citizenship fraud. If this threat is carried out, Mr. Ramadan will be incarcerated for another year or more and enduring the same depravations -- sickness and diseased surroundings.

For an entire month or more, Mr. Ramadan has had no or very limited access to his attorney, legal materials or law library, because of the spread of the coronavirus in the detention center he was exposed to and contracted the virus. In addition to the lockdown that was already in place, he was subjected to a 10 to 14-day quarantine where he had even less access to anything or anyone than he had before.

Even now, unmonitored phone calls are not easily set up. Monitored phone calls are, obviously, not private and are a short duration. Attorney visits have supposedly resumed but at what cost to defense counsel and the family and community

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

```
the attorneys return to. No one was advised that Mr. Ramadan
had tested positive. As a result, I met with Mr. Ramadan
unaware of the risk to my health in doing so. Mr. Ramadan
would not have been retested if not for court intervention.
         The government has argued that Milan and BOP
facilities are safe since the beginning of the pandemic. This
was and continues to be false prophesy. The expansive threat
of the coronavirus within federal, state and local prisons
proves that the virus goes wherever people are gathered
including and especially in close --
         THE INTERPRETER: Your Honor, the interpreter requests
Mr. Densemo go a little bit slower, if you mind.
         MR. DENSEMO: I'm sorry. I will.
         THE INTERPRETER:
                           Thank you.
         THE COURT: Thank you.
         MR. DENSEMO: There's no BOP exemption for the
coronavirus. The effects of the virus within the BOP has been
the severe limitation of access of inmates to their attorneys
and families because of safety protocols and recurring
lockdowns.
            This has given the government even more of an
advantage in the prosecution of pretrial detainees than they
had before.
         Studies have shown that pretrial detainees are more
likely to be convicted and receive higher sentences on average
```

than defendants on pretrial release who are charged with the

same offenses with similar criminal history.

2.4

Mr. Ramadan has been chastised by BOP officials for bringing the lack of contact between he and I to the Court's attention via this bail proceeding. He feels reprisals may be forthcoming. The government will likely brush this off as prison paranoia of Mr. Ramadan's untrustworthiness in reporting on these matters. Despite the skepticism, Mr. Ramadan is truly afraid that should this bond motion fail and he is left in the custody of the detention center, a reason will be found to place him in the special housing unit where he will be isolated and have even less access to his attorney, legal materials and law library.

Mr. Ramadan is not a career or armed career criminal. He does not have a felony conviction. Mr. Ramadan has never been incarcerated in his life from being -- was never incarcerated in his life before being charged in this case. Mr. Ramadan doesn't even have a misdemeanor crime of violence. He doesn't have a history of missed court appointments, traffic warrants, probation or parole violations. He doesn't have a history of substance abuse. He doesn't have any DUI offenses. No domestic violence offenses. He doesn't have any connections or associations with gangs or organized crime.

He has a 10 to 15-year history of employment. He is married with four children. He has strong ties to the community and after three and a half years there's no evidence

that he has ever done anything to jeopardize the safety of U.S. 1 2 citizens through acts of support of anti-government groups or organizations. 3 Mr. Ramadan's name and religion didn't justify his 4 detention in 2017 and they still do not support his detention 5 41 months later. The government's stated reasons for detaining 6 7 Mr. Ramadan have all expired. They do not have an 8 indeterminate shelf life. The prosecution has argued against Mr. Ramadan's pretrial release using a set of factors 9 antithetical to the mandates of Bail Reform Act. The nature of 10 11 the offense and the history and characteristics of the individual have become subordinate to suspicion and 12 speculation. 13 There once was a man named Arif Naqi, Arif, A-r-i-f. 14 Nagi, N-a-g-i. And Arif Nagi was the lead defendant in a 15 16 91-defendant case, United States versus the Highway Motorcycle Club or motorcycle gang. Mr. Nagi filed three bond motions in 17 his case. He was held in custody approximately 36 months. 18 Не finally filed an interlocutory appeal. 19 20 In his appeal, the Sixth Circuit said Mr. Nagi argues 21 that he presented sufficient evidence to rebut the presumption. The Court of Appeals says we do not agree. The presumption 22 23 does not banish simply because the defendant comes forward with 2.4 evidence to rebut it where the presumption to banish given too

little deference to congress's finding regarding this class.

The court found, however, that Mr. Nagi should be released because he had spent too much time in custody in pretrial detention. The court says a period of pretrial detention as long as Nagi weighs in favor of finding a due process violation, but it's not dispositive. The second factor, the extent of the prosecution's responsibility for delay also weighs in Nagi's favor.

The government must bear some responsibility for the more than two-year delay between Nagi's arrest and the superseding indictment. The charges against Nagi are serious, but they do not include the even more serious conspiracy to commit murder charges that some of Nagi's co-defendants face. Some of whom remain free on bond and none of whom have spent anywhere close to a three plus year --

THE INTERPRETER: Your Honor, the interpreter requests Mr. Densemo go a little bit slower. The camera is away from his mouth so the interpreter is not even able to see -- to read the pronunciation of what is happening and it's very difficult to go this long with the sound issues on the mic.

So the interpreter is just asking, please, the court, to just go a little bit slower so she is able -- so the interpreter is able to give an accurate interpretation.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Densemo, can you address your -- adjust your camera so that she can maybe be aided by reading lips where

1 necessary. MR. DENSEMO: Okay. That's fine, Your Honor. 2 Mr. Nagi was eventually -- was -- the court ruled in 3 Mr. Nagi's favor that the three year period of detention that 4 he had been in was a due process violation. Mr. Nagi -- the 5 case was sent back. Judge Edmunds released Mr. Nagi on bond. 6 7 Two years later Mr. Nagi was sentenced. 8 Mr. Nagi, Your Honor, was sentenced to 340 months on Count One; 324 months on Count Two; 10 years concurrent -- five 9 10 years concurrent on Count 16; 324 months concurrent on Count 11 19; 10 years consecutive on Count 31. 12 Mr. Ramadan isn't facing anywhere near that kind of time. Despite the fact that Mr. Nagi was looking at a 13 substantial period of incarceration, the Court of Appeals says 14 three years in custody is too long. 15 There is no end in sight for this case. The Court is 16 not responsible and cannot control the court reopening. We are 17 all waiting for some relief in terms of this pandemic. But we 18 don't know when Mr. Ramadan's case is going to be set for 19 20 trial. No one knows. We don't know when the court is going to 21 reopen, Your Honor. So conceivably, this case can stretch into 22 the end of this year or possibly into next year. Are we going to continue to allow use of Mr. Ramadan 23 2.4 to remain in custody for another six months to a year? For 25 another month?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

As I indicated, Your Honor, this is a presumption case in favor of Mr. Ramadan. You have a man with a misdemeanor conviction for a -- receiving Social Security benefits. In any other circumstance, Mr. Ramadan would have been released. This is the only client that I have ever represented in 30 years who has been in custody this long for this kind of offense with the background that Mr. Ramadan has. It is mind boggling to me that this client is still in custody. He should not be. Every measure that has ever been utilized says that Mr. Ramadan should be released. He should have been released a long time ago. And if the reasons that the government proffered in 2017 were viable then, they're not viable now. That was four years ago, Your Honor. How long are we going to let the government get away with using the same tired rationale? Are we going to allow this rationale to continue into next year and into the following year? The Sixth Circuit said in Mr. Nagi's case enough is Despite the violence of the highwaymen, despite the violence charged in the indictment, despite the violence associated with Mr. Nagi or alleged against Mr. Nagi, enough is enough. Long enough is long enough and you have to release him. If you put all of that together, Your Honor, with the time that he's been in custody and the problems that

Mr. Ramadan and I are having and other defense attorneys and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
their clients are having with an inmate participating in their
defense, having access to their lawyer, receiving the effective
assistance of counsel, Mr. Nagi -- I'm sorry. Mr. Ramadan must
be released today, Your Honor. As the Sixth Circuit indicated
there's -- due process requires his release.
         Thank you, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Thank you.
         Mr. Moon, response?
         MR. MOON: Yes, Your Honor. Preliminarily, obviously,
the detention facility was not going to disclose Mr. Ramadan's
sensitive medical history to anyone outside of Mr. Ramadan and
that would include his attorney. Mr. Ramadan knew that he
tested positive and he could have shared that with Mr. Densemo
at any point. But I don't think anybody's asking the prison
officials, the Bureau of Prisons, to share medical information
outside a patient without their request.
         As for his due process argument, this is the first
time he's made that argument. It's not in either of his
earlier motions --
         MR. DENSEMO: That's not true. Mr. Moon, I beg to
differ.
        It is. I said in my motion enough is enough and he's
been incarcerated long enough. So this is no surprise to you.
         MR. MOON: Mr. Densemo, I'm speaking.
         THE COURT: All right. Excuse me. So Mr. Densemo,
you'll have an opportunity to respond, but please don't
```

interrupt. Thank you.

2.4

MR. DENSEMO: All right.

MR. MOON: He did not cite the due process clause or this Nagi case. And we're left with the facts here. And the first, obviously, Mr. Ramadan, Mr. Densemo, the Court and the government is concerned with the time that Mr. Ramadan has spent in prison. But there's two aspects to that. The first are, A, his guidelines, and B, what he will be sentenced to.

We don't know what his guidelines are. The government believes they will be higher or will push for them to be higher. And even if they aren't, given the facts of this case, the government will ask for a sentence above 41 months. So we don't know what the Court will do in that regard.

And second, contrary to the Nagi case, we have to look at the delay here. Mr. Densemo keeps saying that this is a four-year delay and that's -- first, it's 40 months to be fully accurate. But even then, the overwhelming majority of that delay is on Mr. Ramadan. Mr. Ramadan kept pushing his trial date. As I mentioned, in December of 2019 Mr. Densemo filed a bond motion -- or filed a motion asking to push the trial date once again. That was two years after he had been arrested on these charges. He claimed that he didn't have access to his discovery at that time. But as the discovery logs have shown, he viewed his discovery for 75 hours in the three months prior to that motion. Those allegations simply aren't true. And the

2.4

government opposed that request and asked Judge Battani to set this or to keep the trial date in 2019, which would have mitigated this entire issue. Judge Battani, I believe over her better judgment, decided to give Mr. Densemo the extra time and that brought us into COVID time.

And certainly these are difficult times. They are times that are beyond our control, but they don't obviate or they don't require Mr. Ramadan's release.

As we pointed out in our motion, Mr. Densemo has not actually cited any grounds for either reopening this hearing or for the defendant's release. If you look at 3142(f), that requires new information material to Mr. Ramadan's either risk of flight or detention as Your Honor already found in this case last year. He provided nothing on that.

The other issue is 3142(i), temporary detention. And this issue was already decided upon by the Sixth Circuit in this very case in which they held, quote, temporary release is not warranted when a defendant has had ample time to prepare his defense even given the practical limitations on his access to telephones and the attorney conference room, end quote.

Again, that's the Sixth Circuit in this case. The government has provided evidence that Mr. Ramadan has reviewed his discovery for hundreds of hours. And there's no evidence in this record besides the brief period in December when Mr. Ramadan was in quarantine and the facility was admittedly

2.4

slowed down, shut at times, that he's ever been denied access to discovery or his counsel.

So really we're left with Mr. Ramadan's pleas that he should be out of jail because he served 40 months. And, again, that neither applies to any support in the law, but also completely ignores the danger and flight risk that Mr. Ramadan poses that Mr. Densemo simply ignores. The thousand ISIS images and videos that were found on his person. The export control items he tried to take out of the United States and tactical gear, body armor, TASERs, knives, clips, a gas mask, the stolen firearm that Mr. Ramadan himself stole, the two firearms with obliterated serial numbers.

The homemade silencer that Mr. Ramadan filmed himself shooting out the window of an apartment complex, his making homemade pipe bombs, the storage locker full of weapons, all completely ignored by Mr. Ramadan. We talk about his flight risk. His family is not in the United States and Mr. Ramadan is a dual citizen and there's no reason to believe he wouldn't leave if he had a chance. He was caught with escape gear in his cell at Milan. And when asked about it, gave two different stories to two different judges, including yourself, Your Honor.

Finally, his repeated lies to the Court have to be taken into consideration. At every opportunity he has misled this Court and there's no reason to believe that would change

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

should he be released on bond. The government working with defense counsel has done everything we could. We offered a bench trial, as the Court is well aware, to Mr. Ramadan and he responded he would only take that if we granted him bond and provided copies of the grand jury transcript, which is statutory -- restricted by Rule 60 and Sixth Circuit case law. He asked for a conditional plea which the government took through its supervision chain all the way to D.C., gained approval for and at which point now he's not interested in. The fact of the matter is, it's not the government that is delaying this case. Mr. Ramadan is responsible for the overwhelming majority of the delay here and the rest is due to COVID, which is unfortunate. But Mr. Ramadan has already had COVID and now has those antibodies and there are zero pending cases in the detention center. So, you know, first, there are no grounds under 3142 to open this hearing. But even if they were, he is a danger and a flight risk and the government will maintain that position until this case resolved. However Mr. Ramadan chooses to resolve it. Thank you. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Do you have any rebuttal, Mr. Densemo? MR. DENSEMO: Yes, Your Honor. The government forgets that Mr. Ramadan's attorneys -- not Mr. Ramadan. Mr. Ramadan's attorney filed a motion because the government -- not these two

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

U.S. attorneys. But the prior U.S. attorneys were playing fast and loose with discovery and we had to make repeated discovery requests. With every discovery request we made, we received Discovery that the U. S attorney's office said new discovery. wasn't there. So the idea that Mr. Ramadan and his attorneys were just filing motions because we had nothing better to do is mistaken. We filed these discovery motions because we had to. Because the U.S. Attorney's Office, the prior U.S. attorneys weren't complying with their discovery obligations. Mr. Salzenstein and Mr. Moon have. And maybe if they were the attorneys at the beginning of the case, the case would have been resolved a lot quicker. But because we had the attorneys on the case that we had at the beginning, there were a lot of problems and it was heavily litigated and it had to be heavily litigated. So those motions that were filed were filed by Mr. Ramadan's attorneys because they needed to be filed. Also, the government wanted the deposition testimony of Phillip Prader (ph). They filed a motion to have Mr. Prader's testimony in deposition form. That required -- we objected to that. The government -- Judge Battani ruled in the government's favor. We then had to go to California to take the deposition of Mr. Prader. Obviously, that took a lot of time as well.

We asked for a conditional plea early on in these

2.4

proceedings. We were denied. We didn't even get -- it wasn't even considered. A conditional plea has only been offered within the last 30 days or the last -- to be honest with you, within the last two weeks.

Now as to this issue about a bench trial, Mr. Ramadan initiated those conversations. I initiated those conversations about whether or not a bench trial in this case would make sense. Not the government. It wasn't the government saying, hey, Mr. Ramadan, how about a bench trial and he said, well, no I'll do a bench trial in exchange for this.

My point is, Your Honor, the government wants to put all of this on Mr. Ramadan as if somehow he's responsible for COVID and for his lawyers being lawyers and doing what they need to do. Mr. Ramadan is not responsible for all of this delay. He has litigated this case with the assistance of his attorneys in the way that it needed to be litigated.

The suppression issue is a very important issue and one that is still evolving. That took a great deal of time to research that and to file the motions and to have the hearing and for Judge Battani to issue a ruling.

There's discovery in this case, Your Honor, on at least four different devices. One of them is an eight terabyte hard drive filled to capacity. And there is discovery on other external hard drives as well. That information had to be downloaded which took weeks to download from the devices that

2.4

the U.S. Attorney's Office had on to our external hard drive and then we had to make arrangements to get those devices into the prison.

So the idea that Mr. Ramadan has wasted all of these times, Your Honor, is a false notion. That's not true. That's not true at all. So to say that he's responsible for all these delays is an unfair statement to place on him. But then, Your Honor, if you look at this case and you take away the ISIS, there's no basis to detain Mr. Ramadan.

And Mr. Hank -- I'm sorry. Mr. Moon brings that up and it's unfortunate that he brings up that because we were going so well in terms of this hearing without that having to be introduced. But I think that is in the background of all of this, that Mr. Ramadan is being blamed for ISIS. Despite the fact that -- as I indicated in my motion, despite the fact that Mr. Ramadan had said I don't believe in violence. I don't believe in the violence that that group engages in. I believe in some religious tenets.

Nobody ever says anything about that. No one has ever said Mr. Ramadan said I don't believe in the violence that that group engages in. And then you couple that with the fact that Mr. Ramadan has never engaged in any violence that supports what any group that is counter to this country. And it's a shame that we have to continually talk about this instead of talking about normal bail reform issues. Well, if we talk

```
1
    about normal bail reform issues -- I mean, bail factors,
 2
    Mr. Ramadan wins, Judge. He wins hands down because you pretty
    much check every box in his favor.
 3
              He hits every box -- employment, lack of criminal
 4
    history, presumption in his favor, nonviolent offenses, family
 5
    ties. All of those things you check in Mr. Ramadan's box.
 6
 7
    as I indicated, Judge, it just boggles my mind why he is still
 8
    in custody. And he should be released, Your Honor, and we're
 9
    asking that he be released today.
              THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
10
11
              Linda -- excuse me one moment.
12
              What time is my next hearing is it 11:30 or 12:00?
              THE CLERK OF THE COURT: Let me check the calendar,
13
    Judge.
14
              THE COURT: Just give me one moment, everyone.
15
          (Momentary pause.)
16
              THE COURT: All right. It's at 1:00. I thought it
17
    was sooner than that. I'm fine, then.
18
              All right. I'm prepared to rule on this motion for
19
20
    bond.
              Under the Bail Reform Act detention is allowed under
21
    these circumstances: Where there is a presumption in favor of
22
    release only if there is no condition or combination of
23
2.4
    conditions that will reasonably assure appearance and safety of
25
    the community. It is the burden of the defendant to show that
```

2.4

he is not a flight risk or a danger to the community. And in making that determination, the Court is required to take into account on the nature of charges, whether there was a weapon involved, the weight of the evidence, the history and characteristics of the defendant, the nature and seriousness of danger. And then it is the government's burden to prove by clear and convincing evidence that no condition can ensure the safety of the community and to demonstrate by a preponderance of evidence that no condition can reasonably assure the appearance of the defendant.

The bail determination in this case was denied 40 months ago and there is a record that has been made that certainly was justifiable at the time and justified the detention of Mr. Ramadan. And I don't need to make a record again of those determinations that were made by the Court.

But in addition to the Bail Reform Act, the Court has available to it a couple of other provisions of the law that it can take into account if it is reconsidering that issue of bail. One is 3142(g). It says, "In addition, a bail hearing can be reopened before or after determination by the judicial officer at any time before trial if the judicial officer finds that information exists that was not known to the movant at the time of the hearing and that has a material bearing on the issue whether there are conditions of release that will reasonably assure the appearance of such person as required and

```
1
    the safety of any other person in the community."
              And the Court also has available to it 3142(f) which
 2
    says: "The Court may permit the temporary release of an inmate
 3
    in the custody of the United States Marshal or another
 4
    appropriate --"
 5
              AUTOMATED VOICE: Your meeting has ended.
 6
 7
          (At 11:45 a.m., defendant video disconnected.)
 8
              THE COURT: How do we get him back?
 9
              THE INTERPRETER: Yes, Your Honor, the interpreter is
    still on the jail on a cell phone.
10
              THE CLERK OF THE COURT: Can you ask is the -- can you
11
12
    ask them to reconnect the video?
              THE INTERPRETER: He has already requested.
13
         (At 11:49 a.m., defendant's video reconnected.)
14
              THE COURT: I believe his call concluded when I was
15
    about to talk about the provision of 3142(f) which allows a
16
    bail hearing to be reopened as well.
17
18
              MR. DENSEMO: Yup.
              THE COURT: And that statute says: "The Court may
19
20
    permit the temporary release of an inmate in the custody of the
21
    United States Marshal or another appropriate person to the
    extent that the Court determines such release to be necessary
22
23
    for preparation of the person's defense or for another
2.4
    compelling reason."
25
              And the Court finds it appropriate to reopen the bail
```

2.4

determination in this case under both of those provisions. So that is the bail law. I think that there's some overriding principles, considerations that come into play in this decision as well. One, is the presumption of innocence. And because pretrial detainees are presumed innocent, they are entitled to more considerate treatment and conditions of confinement than criminals whose conditions of confinement are designed to punish. The Supreme Court said that in Youngberg versus Romeo, 457 U.S. 307,322 a 1982 case.

Another overriding principle and consideration have been touched on by Mr. Densemo here and that has to do with potential due process clause violations. And some courts have held that extended pretrial detention can violate the due process clause. Mr. Densemo cited us to one.

Another, United States versus Millan, M-i-l-l-a-n,

4 F.3d 1038, a Second Circuit case, 1993 and that court held,

"When detention becomes excessively prolonged, it may no longer
be reasonable in relation to the regulatory goals of detention
in which event a violation of due process occurs."

The Fifth Amendment due process clause right against pretrial punishment is an omnipresent consideration in criminal cases. The Court held in *Bell versus Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 1979, "The determination whether these restrictions and practices constitute punishment in the constitutional sense depends on whether they are rationally related to a legitimate,

2.4

nonpunitive governmental purpose and whether they appear excessive in relation to that purpose."

So those are some over -- that's the law. Some overriding principles that this Court has certainly been thinking about. The Ramadan case has weighed very heavily on me. As Mr. Densemo pointed out, I don't think in 20 years I've had a case quite like this where a person was in pretrial detention for this long, particularly, where he was approaching the -- certainly has approached the lowest guideline point and with other considerations, good time considerations, being thrown in perhaps has exceeded the amount of time that he would serve if the Court were to sentence him.

So although COVID-19 is a recent and evolving development, courts addressing similar applications have allowed that COVID-19 in conjunction with other factors particular to a defendant may constitute an emergency warranting relief under the Bail Reform Act for that defendant.

That is to say the COVID-19 pandemic is not by itself a basis for release of a pretrial detainee for which the Court has already held a detention hearing and ordered the defendant detained. Instead, the paramount consideration under sections 3142(g) and (i) that I just cited to continues to be the individual circumstances of the particular pretrial detainee. And that was held recently in several cases out of the District of Maryland, United States versus Filbro (ph) and another case.

And I'm not sure what district court that came out of.

2.4

So in the end, a defendant is not entitled to temporary release under Section 3142 based solely on generalized COVID-19 fears and speculation. Rather, the Court must make an individual determination as to whether the COVID-19 concerns present such a compelling reason in a particular case that temporary release becomes necessary.

In this motion that has been filed for bail there are three basic reasons given: The increase in COVID cases at Milan, the lack of access to counsel that Mr. Ramadan says he has not had and the fact that he is a pretrial detainee.

With respect to the number of cases at Milan, I know that the statistics that we have now are that there's zero cases. We had statistics that have waxed and waned since March. They were low over the course of the summer. It seems like in December they became quite high and there was a general lockdown. And that only goes to how fluid this pandemic is and how unpredictable it is. And while it may not be the fault of anybody on this call, it does effect the basic rights that this Court outlined before. Particularly, where we are talking about a -- where we are talking about a pretrial detainee.

So I do think -- this Court does find that there are compelling reasons under 3142(f) for the release of Mr. Ramadan and the Court believes that some of these compelling reasons are also information that was not known to this Court when the

2.4

original bail hearing was held. And those things include that Mr. Ramadan has now, in fact, contracted COVID. He has fortunately survived it. But I think that the jury is still out on whether and how people can contract COVID all over again.

Mr. Moon, you said now he's got antibodies developed, but that's not entirely true. I mean, we don't know and we don't know about the risk of reinfection. The CDC has talked about the probability of transmission of potent dangerous organisms and that has increased by the crowded conditions in places and places like Milan. And so maybe it is relief to Mr. Ramadan that he's already contracted COVID, but we really don't know about the risk of reinfection.

So the question becomes would he have gotten COVID if he were not in the kinds of crowded conditions that are present in Milan as a pretrial detainee, and that is a consideration that this Court takes into account. And that is information that was not known at the time of the initial bail hearing.

He has also served a substantial percentage of the sentence that this Court might impose on him. Mr. Moon has said that the government may be asking for time in excess of the guidelines that have been calculated. And I don't know that these are correct calculations, but Mr. Bellamy from our probation department has come up with calculations that agree with those of the government, at least at this moment in time,

and those guidelines are 51 to 63 months.

2.4

Mr. Densemo says that that works out to be 85 percent. With the 41 months that he's already served, he has served 85 percent of what would be a five-year sentence in that guideline range. And with good time credit that he may be entitled to under the First Step Act, he may even be eligible for release. If not right now, but released sooner. And so we have here someone who has not been convicted of a crime. The government has substantial evidence that the crimes he's charged with have been committed, but there has been no conviction here.

Another thing that the Court believes is a compelling reason under 3142(f) is that with this pretrial detention,

Mr. Ramadan has not had the benefit of any programs that someone who has been convicted of a crime would have had the benefit of. And we incarcerate people for punitive reasons.

We also incarcerate them hopefully for rehabilitative reasons and that's why these programs have been developed. And

Mr. Ramadan has not had the benefit of any of those things and it's very concerning to the Court that he may be near the end of a sentence that I would impose on him and he has not enjoyed any of those programs.

One of the factors under 3142(f) is that it is necessary -- release is necessary for the person to be able to assist in the preparation of a person's defense. I have no reason to doubt that Mr. Moon, in fact, received the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

information that he conveyed to the Court. And I have no reason to doubt that as an officer of the court that Mr. Densemo is telling us about the access problems that he has had in meeting with his client. And it's not just Mr. Ramadan's access within the prison facility to the information, it sounds like he has had that access, but access to his attorney to consider the issues that are still on this If that has been compromised because of COVID, because of lockdowns, because of systems that are in place that are supposed to work but are not working, the Court does believe that that would be a factor under 3142(f) to allow for his temporary release. We also have found out -- and this was not something that was presented to the Court before. And I know that there have been courts that have said where inmates are being released to family members, that may constitute an appropriate person and a compelling reason as well for the release of the defendant. We have here a sister who is on the line who has agreed to be a third-party custodian for Mr. Ramadan and that was not presented to the Court before. So I know that the lawyers have talked about a number of other things that are appropriately a part of this record. I don't believe that it's necessary for me to get to those things, the things that I have just placed in the record are sufficient under 3142(g) and sufficient under 3142(f) to allow

```
for Mr. Ramadan's release.
 1
              I do hope that Mr. Ramadan, having already contracted
 2
    COVID and knowing the seriousness of this, is going to take the
 3
    conditions that the Court sets on him very, very seriously and
 4
    make certain that he isn't exposing himself again or
 5
    potentially exposing other people by not abiding by the
 6
 7
    conditions. One of which is going to include his house arrest.
 8
              Ms. Trevino, I did ask you to take a look at potential
 9
    conditions that we could set. Did you send those to me?
10
    have them now?
11
              MS. TREVINO: Yes, Your Honor, Patricia Trevino from
    Pretrial Services. Maureen Shock, supervisor, E-mailed those
12
    to you.
13
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you. I'll take a
14
    look at them.
15
             Ms. Ramadan, is it Ramadan as well who is on the line,
16
    the sister?
17
              THE COURT: Does your sister speak English?
18
              MS. RAMADAN: This is her. I'm speaking, Your
19
20
    Honor.
21
              THE COURT: Okay.
22
              MS. RAMADAN: Asma Ramadan.
              THE COURT: Could you --
23
              MS. RAMADAN:
                            First name ...
24
              THE COURT: Go ahead.
25
```

```
1
              MS. RAMADAN: First name is A-s-m-a. Last name
 2
    exactly like Yousef, R-a-m-a-d-a-n.
              THE COURT: All right. Ms. Ramadan, I think you had a
 3
    conversation the other day with Ms. Lara Catrell from the court
 4
    about you potentially being a third-party custodian for your
 5
    brother.
 6
 7
              MS. RAMADAN: Yes, Your Honor.
 8
              THE COURT: And I hope you understand the importance
 9
    of the role that you have assumed to undertake and the duty
10
    that you have as a third-party custodian. Which is, number
11
    one, he's going to be in your home. He's going to be under
12
    house arrest. He's going to be on a tether. There are
    conditions that you will be aware of that he must abide by and
13
    it's going to be your responsibility to make sure he does that.
14
    Do you understand?
15
16
              MS. RAMADAN: Yes, Your Honor.
              THE COURT: And it's also going to be your
17
    responsibility to let whoever is going to be supervising him
18
    know immediately if there are any conditions that the Court
19
20
    sets that your brother doesn't abide by. Do you understand
21
    that?
              MS. RAMADAN: Yes, Your Honor.
22
              THE COURT: And are you going to be able to do that?
23
              MS. RAMADAN:
                            Yes, Your Honor.
24
25
              THE COURT: I just want to get to these conditions so
```

```
1
    that we've made a complete record. One moment.
              You said Maureen sent them to me -- there we go.
 2
                                                                 One
    minute.
 3
              These are the conditions, Ms. Ramadan and Mr. Ramadan,
 4
    and I want to make sure that I have your agreement on these
 5
    conditions. Number one, you cannot violate any federal, state
 6
 7
    or local law during the period of time that you are on release.
 8
    You have to cooperate in the collection of a DNA sample. You
    have to notify the Court or your supervising officer in writing
 9
10
    before you make any change of your residence or change in a
11
    telephone number. You must appear for any court proceeding as
12
    required and if there is an additional sentence to be imposed
    on you, you must surrender to serve that sentence.
13
              You will be given -- you will be notified of when your
14
    next appearance will be. We don't quite know what that is
15
    given this fluid situation with COVID.
16
              You are going to be in the custody of Asma Ramadan.
17
              Your name is going to be as part of these papers,
18
19
    Ms. Ramadan, and you will sign a separate third-party
20
    agreement.
21
              You will have certain reporting requirements,
22
    Mr. Ramadan, and you have to abide by that. You have to
23
    surrender your passport to Pretrial Services --
              MS. RAMADAN: Your Honor?
2.4
25
              THE COURT: Yes, ma'am?
```

```
1
              MS. RAMADAN: Are these conditions for me?
 2
              THE COURT: They are conditions for your brother, but
    you have to be aware of them so that you can make certain he
 3
    does them.
 4
              MS. RAMADAN: Okay.
 5
              THE COURT: You have to surrender your passport and
 6
 7
    you are to not obtain any other passport or other international
 8
    travel documents. You do have another passport, Mr. Ramadan?
    You have dual citizenship?
 9
              MS. RAMADAN: Are you talking to me?
10
11
              THE DEFENDANT: Is she talking to me? I believe so.
12
              THE COURT: Yes, I am.
              THE DEFENDANT: All of my passports the government
13
    took them from me in the airport. And all my -- even my
14
    documents, I believe they still have it. But I do have the
15
    Sicilian (ph) citizenship and United States citizenship.
16
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. Your travel is going to
17
    be -- you can put yourself back on mute.
18
              THE DEFENDANT:
                             (Complies.)
19
20
              THE COURT: Your travel is restricted to the Eastern
21
    District of Michigan and you are not to possess a firearm, a
    destructive device or any other dangerous weapon. You also are
22
23
    ordered to participate in home incarceration and you are
    restricted to 24-hour a day lockdown except for medical
2.4
25
    necessities and court appearances or other activities that are
```

```
specifically approved by the Court. You will have a tether
 1
 2
    attached to you and you must submit to have that attached.
              Ms. Trevino, you can remove the payment requirement.
 3
              And then finally I think it's -- we've already said
 4
    it. But you can't change your address, but you also must
 5
    reside with your sister unless you're given permission to
 6
    reside otherwise.
 7
 8
              So, counsel, those are the conditions. Mr. Moon, I
    know you don't agree with the release, but is there any other
 9
10
    condition that you believe the Court should impose?
11
              MR. MOON: As for conditions, Your Honor, we ask that
12
    Mr. Ramadan and his family or through his family be prohibited
    from contacting any of the witnesses in this case. Either in
13
    person, via phone, E-mail, text, by a family member. You know,
14
    no contact with any witnesses in anyway, please.
15
              THE COURT: Okay. All right.
16
              MS. TREVINO: Your Honor, this is Patricia Trevino
17
    from pretrial services. May I address the Court?
18
              THE COURT: You may.
19
              MS. TREVINO: On the record -- and you may have said
20
21
    this. I was writing things down.
22
              Did the condition of not obtaining a passport or other
    international travel documents, was that added on the record?
23
              THE COURT:
                         It was.
2.4
25
              MS. TREVINO: Okay. Thank you.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
THE COURT:
                    Let me just go back. You must surrender
any passport and not obtain a passport or other international
travel documents.
         MS. TREVINO: Thank you, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Mr. Moon, that's your addition?
         MR. MOON: Yes, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
         Mr. Densemo?
         MR. DENSEMO: Your Honor, we would like a witness list
so that I can give that to Mr. Ramadan so he will know who he's
not to contact.
         THE COURT: All right. That's fair.
         You can do that, Mr. Moon?
                   Yes, Your Honor.
         MR. MOON:
         MR. DENSEMO: And, Your Honor, I'd like the Court to
consider home detention versus home incarceration. And the
reason for that is that if Mr. Ramadan wants to come and see
me, I believe that we would need a stipulated order between
Mr. Salzenstein and Mr. Moon and I. So there would have to be
constant court authority for Mr. Ramadan to even leave his home
for any reason. At least that's my understanding with my other
client that's on home incarceration. Every time he has to go
to a medical appointment, I have to call the U.S. attorney to
get a stipulation for him to be allowed to do so for any
purposes like that and it just becomes really cumbersome as
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
opposed to allowing home detention and then the individual can
just provide the information to pretrial and pretrial can give
the individual the authorization to go to medical appointments,
religious services, grocery shopping, things like that.
         THE COURT: I just want to go back and look at how
this is worded. It isn't my intention to require that there be
a stipulation every time, but let me see what this says.
         MR. DENSEMO: Patty, I think you can talk to that.
                                                             Αm
I correct in that or am I incorrect?
         THE COURT: It says, "You are restricted except for
medical necessities and court appearances or other activities
specifically approved by the court."
         So medical, court appearances, I don't think that
requires a stipulation from the government.
         But, Ms. Trevino, how does this typically work?
         MS. TREVINO: Typically, they are on restricted
24-hour lockdown to their home. Except for those reasons when
someone has to see their attorney, they will contact pretrial
services, U.S. Attorneys and it gets entered into a court
order. I ...
         MR. DENSEMO: I think home incarceration serves the
same purpose, Your Honor. It just eliminates the necessity of
the Court intervention. The U.S. Attorneys and the attorneys
and the Court having to enter an order. At least that's my
understanding.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
I think Patty can still maintain the same level of
supervision and restrictions through home detention, it's just
that we wouldn't have to constantly be -- I wouldn't have to
constantly call Hank or Doug to get a stipulation for him to go
to go someplace.
         MR. MOON: Your Honor, from the government's position,
we have no objection. If Ms. Trevino knows that he's going to
visit his attorneys, the government doesn't need to be involved
in that conversation.
         THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm going to leave it
at home incarceration. It's not my intention that the
government stipulate to these exceptions.
         Mr. Densemo, right now it says for medical necessities
and court appearances. We can add in there attorney visits and
I think it's just a matter of notification.
         MR. DENSEMO: That's fine.
         THE COURT: From Mr. Ramadan to pretrial services.
         MR. DENSEMO: That's fine. That's fine, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: All right.
         MS. TREVINO: Yes. Everything will have to be
approved, if he leaves his home, from the pretrial services
officer.
         MR. DENSEMO: That's fine.
         THE COURT: Okay. All right. Is there anything more
that anyone has before we close the record?
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

```
MS. TREVINO: Your Honor, would you like us to place
the tether on him at Milan before he is -- or as he is
released?
         THE COURT:
                    That would probably make the most sense.
Somebody can do it at Milan?
         MS. TREVINO: Yes. We can make arrangements for an
officer to go out there and I would just want the record to
reflect that he cannot be released unless we're there to place
the tether on him.
         THE COURT: Okay.
         MR. MOON: Your Honor, two quick issues. One, just
for clarity, is this a temporary release and if so, is there an
end to that release or is this a permanent release?
         THE COURT:
                    Well, the wording of that statute says
temporary detention. I am -- I don't have an end date for that
at this point in time. I think that, you know, perhaps we can
revisit it when the parties have come to the court and said
that you maybe want to put a plea on the record. But I don't
have an end date right now because things are just too fluid.
         If anything happens, if Mr. Ramadan doesn't abide by
anything, that will, of course, end it immediately. But we'll
see.
         MR. MOON: And then second, Your Honor, we would ask
that the Court stay this order for one week so the United
States can decide whether to appeal.
```

```
THE COURT: Okay. I deny that request.
 1
 2
              MR. MOON: Thank you, Your Honor. Nothing further
    from the United States.
 3
              THE COURT: Okay.
 4
              MS. TREVINO: And, Your Honor, we're going to
 5
    coordinate with the Marshals Service in Milan.
                                                     I'm not sure
 6
 7
    how long it will take to -- we'll try to get that done today,
 8
    but it may not get done until tomorrow. I'm not sure because
    we haven't had a case such as this case at the detention
 9
10
    center, but we will keep the Court and Mr. Densemo and the
11
    government apprised of how long that's going to take.
12
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
             Anything more?
13
              MR. DENSEMO: There's no way that you guys can meet
14
    him at his house and put the tether on today?
15
              MS. TREVINO: We could do that. It will be up to the
16
    judge. We do it at the facilities when they're released and we
17
    also have done it at their home. That's completely up to the
18
            We will not know from the time he's released to the
19
20
    time he gets home where his whereabouts are without the GPS
21
    tether.
22
              MR. DENSEMO: I think Ms. Ramadan will pick him up as
23
    his third-party custodian and be with him at her home
2.4
    throughout the balance of the day.
25
              Am I right about that, Asma?
```

```
I'm sorry, Andrew. Can you repeat what
 1
              MS. RAMADAN:
 2
    you said, please.
              MR. DENSEMO: You will pick him up at the facility and
 3
    take him right to your home and he will be there for the
 4
    balance of the day waiting for pretrial?
 5
              MS. RAMADAN: Yes. Also, I would like to know when is
 6
 7
    the day to pick him up.
 8
             MR. DENSEMO: That would be today if the judge allows
 9
    it.
              THE COURT: Two questions? Is Milan -- can he be
10
11
    released that quickly and, Ms. Ramadan, are you able to get him
12
    today?
             MS. RAMADAN: I live about 20 minutes away. It's
13
    snowing right now. So it's about 25 minutes away from Milan.
14
    It's not that far.
15
16
              THE COURT: Okay.
              MR. DENSEMO: And it's my understanding, Your Honor,
17
    that Mr. Ramadan, he doesn't have any holds or warrants or
18
    anything like that. So he could be released within the hour.
19
20
              MS. TREVINO: And Your Honor, I do have an officer in
21
    the field within the Ann Arbor area that I put on notice that
22
    if you ordered him to be placed on tether at Milan, he can do
23
    that.
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. So if he can get there
24
25
    to Milan, let's get it on. And then you can coordinate the
```

```
time that Ms. Ramadan needs to arrive there, but it sounds like
 1
 2
    it could happen.
 3
              Your officer is able to get to Milan pretty swiftly,
    Ms. Trevino?
 4
              MS. TREVINO: Yes. We already had someone ready just
 5
    in case a release order was implemented and I will call him on
 6
 7
    the phone to give him details and we'll get the paperwork to
 8
    the third-party custodian to get signed, the bond paperwork for
    Mr. Ramadan to sign and we'll contact the marshals and Milan to
 9
10
    see how quickly or what time we can get that done.
11
              THE COURT: Okay. All right. Thank you.
12
              Is there anything more?
              MR. DENSEMO: No, Your Honor.
13
              THE COURT: No. Okay. All right. Thank you everyone
14
    and this hearing is adjourned.
15
16
         (At 12:21 p.m., matter concluded.)
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATE

I, Darlene K. May, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court, Eastern District of Michigan, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. I further certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and the Judicial Conference of the United States.

12 <u>January 16, 2021</u> Date /s/ Darlene K. May
Darlene K. May, CSR, RPR, CRR, RMR
Federal Official Court Reporter
Michigan License No. 6479